29th January 1931]

Alleged ill-treatment of Mr. B. Venkataratnam by the Police at Rajahmundry.

* 183 Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a Police officer forcibly removed from the hands of Mr. B Venkataratnam, ex-M.L.C., a garland and a fruit with which he was honoured on his arrival at Rajahmundry from jail;

(b) what action has been taken against the Police officer for such conduct towards a respectable citizen; and

(c) whether this matter was brought to the notice of the Government by Mr. Venkataratnam?

A.—(a) No.
(b) Does not arise.
(c) The matter was brought to the Government's notice by Mr. Burra Satyanarayana, not by Mr. Venkataratnam.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I ask whether the information of the Government depends upon the report of police officers?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Having regard to the fact that a number of police officers are involved in these matters, and that they are not likely to give accurate information, will the Government pursue the enquiry and find out the facts?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I shall do so, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Having regard to the fact that two or three respectable people have complained to the hon. the Law Member and the hon. the Home Member about the actual incidents as the former were eye-witnesses, are the Government prepared to contradict or refute the charges made against the Police officers who are concerned in this matter?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I shall enquire into the matter."

Alleged lathi charge against a picnic party near Peddapuram.

* 184-A Q.—Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a lathi charge was made against a picnic party in the garden of Raja Gajapathi Varma, two miles from Peddapuram on the 21st December 1930;

(b) how many persons were injured and why the charge was made;

(c) who were the officers who ordered the lathi charge; and

(d) what action the Government have taken against these officers and, if no action has been taken, why not?

[29th January 1931

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The hon. Member is referred to the answers to clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of question No. 230 and clause (*f*) of question No. 231.

(*c*) The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Cocanada.

(*d*) None. The Government consider that the action of the Deputy Superintendent of Police was justified.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Having regard to the reply which the hon. the Home Member gave yesterday in connexion with the debate on the police cut, do the Government still think that no action is necessary ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"As I said yesterday, a pamphlet has been placed in my hands and I shall institute inquiries."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"Having regard to the promise made by the hon. the Home Member that he will further pursue the enquiry and find out the facts, may I ask whether the opinion of the Government that the action of the Superintendent of Police was justified, will be revised."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"It will be revised, if necessary, after the enquiry is made."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—"May I know whether the Government will suspend their judgment on the matter, till they have enquired into the matter ?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Not necessarily ; from the information we have at present, we think that no action against the officer is necessary."

Alleged lathi charge on a picnic party at Peddapuram.

* 184-B *Q.*—Mr. K. KOTI REDDI : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what are the circumstances under which a lathi charge was made by the police on the guests gathered at Vanasantharpana or garden party arranged by Mr. V. R. Gajapat Varma in the garden of Mr. B. Narayanamurti at Peddapuram on the 21st of December 1930 ;

(*b*) whether any prohibitory order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, or under any other law was in force at the time when the gathering was sought to be dispersed by the lathi charge ;

(*c*) whether any Magistrate was present and ordered the gathering to be dispersed as being an unlawful assembly ;

(*d*) whether any other officer gave them an order of dispersal and what was the time allowed for dispersing ;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that the garden in which the party was held was fenced by prickly-pear and other thorny bushes, permitting only one way of escape ;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the one way of escape was blocked by the police lorry ;

(*g*) what was the time taken by the police in delivering the lathi charge for dispersing the gathering ;